arXiv:1605.01440v1 [math.ST] 4 May 2016

Second Order Correctness of Perturbation Bootstrap M-Estimator of Multiple Linear Regression Parameter

Debraj Das and Soumendra Nath Lahiri

North Carolina State University

Abstract. Consider the multiple linear regression model $y_i = \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i$, where ϵ_i's are i.i.d. random variables, $\mathbf{x_i}$'s are known design vectors and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the $p \times 1$ vector of parameters. An effective way of approximating the distribution of the M-estimator $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$, after proper centering and scaling, is the Perturbation Bootstrap Method. In this current work, second order results of this non-naive bootstrap method have been investigated. We show that the classical studentized version of the bootstrapped estimator fails to be second order correct. We introduce an innovative modification in the studentized version of the bootstrapped statistic and show that the modified bootstrapped pivot is second order correct (S.O.C.) for approximating the distribution of the studentized M-estimator. This important result establishes perturbation bootstrap approximation as a significant improvement over asymptotic normality in the regression M-estimation.

Keywords: M-Estimation, S.O.C., Perturbation Bootstrap, Edgeworth Expansion, Studentization

1 Introduction

Consider the multiple linear regression model :

$$y_i = \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$$

where $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ are response, $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with common distribution F (say), $\mathbf{x_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x_n}$ are known non random design vectors and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the p-dimensional vector of parameters. Let, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ is the regression estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ corresponding to the objective function $\Lambda(.)$ i.e. $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{t}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Lambda(y_i - \mathbf{x_i't})$. Then $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the M-estimator corresponding to the score function ψ which means that $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the solution of the vector equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{0}$$

where $\psi = \Lambda'$. It is known [cf. Huber(1981)] that under some conditions on the objective function, design vectors and error distribution F; $(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$ with proper scaling has an asymptotically normal distribution with mean 0 and dispersion matrix $\sigma^2\mathbf{I_p}$

where $\sigma^2 = \mathbf{E}\psi^2(\epsilon_1)/\mathbf{E}^2\psi'(\epsilon_1)$. After introduction of bootstrap [cf. Efron (1979)] as a resampling technique, resampling of centered residuals in a regression setup, called residual bootstrap, was introduced by Freedman(1981). Freedman (1981) and Bickel and Freedman (1981b) had shown that given data, the conditional distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}})$ converges to the same normal distribution as the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$ when $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the usual least square estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, that is, when $\Lambda(x) = x^2$. It implies that the residual bootstrap approximation to the exact distribution of the least square estimator is first order correct as in case of normal approximation. The advantage of the residual bootstrap approximation over normal approximation for the distribution of least square estimator was not evident until Edgeworth Expansion(EE) of the least square estimator was obtained by Qumsiyeh (1990a); although the same was found for general M-estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in restricted case $p = 1$ by Lahiri (1989b). EE of standardized and studentized versions of the general M-estimator in multiple linear regression setup was first obtained by Lahiri (1992). Lahiri (1992) also established the second order results for residual bootstrap in regression M-estimation.

A new type of bootstrap, called the perturbation bootstrap was introduced by Jin, Ying and Wei (2001) as a resampling procedure where the objective function having a U-process structure was perturbed by non-negative random quantities. Jin, Ying and Wei (2001) showed that in standardized setup, the conditional distribution of the perturbation resampling estimator given the data and the distribution of the original estimator have the same limiting distribution which means this resampling method is first order correct without studentization. This random perturbation resampling method was adopted in the general setup of estimating equations by Chatterjee and Bose (2005) and named it"Generalized Bootstrap". Chatterjee and Bose (2005) used the random perturbation in estimating equation mainly to estimate the asymptotic variance of the original estimator and to establish the distributional consistency. In a recent work, Minnier, Tian and Cai (2011) also applied this perturbation resampling method in penalized regression setup such as ALASSO, SCAD, l_q penalty and showed that the standardized perturbed penalized estimator is first order correct. But, second order properties of this new bootstrap method have remained largely unexplored in the context of multiple linear regression. In this current work, the perturbation bootstrap approximation is shown to be S.O.C. for the distribution of studentized M-estimator. Therefore, besides the residual bootstrap, the perturbation bootstrap method can also be used in multiple linear regression setup as an improvement over the normal approximation for making inferences regarding the regression parameters.

A classical way of studentization in bootstrap set-up, in case of regression M-estimator, is to consider the studentization factor to be $\sigma_n^* = s_n^* \tau_n^{*-1}$, $\tau_n^* = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi'(\epsilon_i^*)$, $s_n^{*2} = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi^2(\epsilon_i^*)$ where ϵ_i^*, $1 \leq i \leq n$, are the bootstrap residuals. In perturbation bootstrap, $\epsilon_i^* = y_i - \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*}$ where $\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*}$ is the perturbation bootstrapped estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ as defined in Section 2. Whereas in residual bootstrap, ϵ_i^* is the ith random sample from E_n^F, E_n^F being the empirical distribution corresponding to error

distribution F based on original residuals. It is found that although the residual bootstrapped estimator is S.O.C. after straight-forward studentization, the same pivot fails to be S.O.C. in case of perturbation bootstrap. Two important special cases are considered as examples in this respect. The reason behind this failure is that although the bootstrap residuals are sufficient in capturing variability of the bootstrapped estimator in residual bootstrap, it is not enough in case of perturbation resampling. A general modification has been proposed to sort out this problem and is shown to be S.O.C. The modification is based on the novel idea that the variability of the random perturbing quantities G_i^* $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ along with the bootstrap residuals are just enough to capture the variability of the perturbation bootstrapped estimator; whereas individually they are not sufficient. For technical details, see Section 4.2.

With a view to establishing second order correctness, we start with the standardized setup and then proceed to studentization. First, we prove a suitable linear stochastic approximation of the concerned bootstrapped estimator and then we obtain a two-term EE of the conditional density of that stochastic approximation. The results then follow by comparing the EEs found in case of original and bootstrapped estimators. The techniques that are to be used in finding EE have been demonstrated and discussed in Bhattacharya and Ghosh (1978), Navidi (1989) and Lahiri (1992).

A significant volume of work is available in bootstraping M- estimators. We will conclude this section by briefly reviewing the literature. Bootstrapping M-estimator in linear models has been studied by Navidi(1989), Lahiri (1992, 1994, 1996), Qumsiyeh (1994), Jin, Ying and Wei (2001), Hu (2001), El Bantli (2004), Chatterjee and Bose (2005) among others. And in the applications other than linear model, bootstrapping in M-estimation setup has been investigated by Allen and Datta (1999), Hlavka (2003), Ma and Kosorok (2005), Lahiri and Zhu (2006), Cheng and Huang (2010), Lee (2012), Cheng (2015), among others.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Perturbation bootstrap is described briefly in Section 2. Section 3 states the assumptions and motivations and practical reasons behind considering those assumptions. Main results along-with the modification in bootstrap studentization are stated in Section 4. Proofs are given in Section 5. Section 6 states concluding remarks.

2 Description of Perturbation Bootstrap

Perturbation Bootstrap method differs significantly from residual bootstrap. Whereas in residual bootstrap, the bootstrap approximation of the M-estimator has been obtained by resampling from the residuals with replacement, Perturbation bootstrap has nothing to do with residuals in resampling stage. In M-estimation setup, the objective function $\Lambda(\cdot)$ has been perturbed several times by a non-negative random quantity to get a bootstrapped estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. More precisely, the perturbation bootstrap estimator $\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*}$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*} = \arg\min_{\mathbf{t}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Lambda(y_i - \mathbf{x_i't}) G_i^*$$

or in terms of the score function $\psi(\cdot)$, $\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*}$ is the solution of the vector equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta})G_i^* = \mathbf{0} \tag{2.1}$$

where $G_i^*, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ are non-negative completely known random variable, considered as perturbation quantities. Note that, if μ_{G^*} is the mean of G_1^*, then $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the solution of $\mathbf{E}_*\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x_i}\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta})G_i^*\Big) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x_i}\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta})\mu_{G^*} = 0$. This will be helpful in finding the linear stochastic approximation of the concerned perturbation bootstrapped estimator. For details, see Section 5.

The central idea of the perturbation bootstrap is to draw a relatively large collection of iid random samples $\{(G_1^{*b}, \ldots, G_n^{*b}) : b = 1, \ldots, B\}$ from the distribution of G_1^* and then to find the conditional empirical distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}})$ given data $y_i : i = 1, \ldots, n$, by solving

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta})G_i^{*b} = \mathbf{0}$$

for each $b \in \{1, \ldots, B\}$; to approximate the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$ asymptotically. As a result the bootstrapped distribution may be used as an approximation to the original distribution, just like the normal approximation, in making inferences as for example in constructing confidence intervals, testing of hypotheses regarding $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Now, in the perturbation bootstrap M-estimation, G_i^*'s can be thought of as weight corresponding to the ith data point $(\mathbf{x_i}, y_i)$. To make it easier to understand, consider the least square setup i.e. $\Lambda(x) = x^2$. In this case $\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*}$ takes the form

$$\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*} = \big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\mathbf{x_i'}G_i^*\big)^{-1}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}y_iG_i^*\big)$$

, indicating that the perturbing quantities G_i^*'s can be thought of as weights.

3 Assumptions

Suppose, $\mathbf{x_i} = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{ip})'$. Define, $\mathbf{D_n} \equiv \mathbf{D} = (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x_i}\mathbf{x_i'})^{1/2}$, $\mathbf{A_n} = n^{-1}\mathbf{D_n^2}$, $\mathbf{d_i} = \mathbf{D^{-1}}\mathbf{x_i}$, $1 \le i \le n$ and $q = \dfrac{p(p+1)}{2}$. Also define, $q \times 1$ vector $\mathbf{z_i} = (x_{i1}^2, x_{i1}x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{i1}x_{ip}, x_{i2}^2, x_{i2}x_{i3}, \ldots, x_{i2}x_{ip}, \ldots, x_{ip}^2)'$. Note that for any constants $a_i, \ldots, a_n \in \mathscr{R}$, $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\mathbf{z_i} = \mathbf{0}$ which is implies and implied by $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\mathbf{x_i}\mathbf{x_i'} = \mathbf{0}$. Hence, $\{\mathbf{z_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{z_n}\}$ are linearly independent if and only if $\{\mathbf{x_i}\mathbf{x_i'} : 1 \le i \le n\}$ are linearly independent. Therefore, $r_n =$ the rank of $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{z_i}\mathbf{z_i'}$ is nondecreasing in n. So, if $r = max\{r_n : n \ge 1\}$ then without loss of generality (w.l.g.), we can assume that $r_n = r$ for all $n \ge q$. Consider canonical decomposition of $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{z_i}\mathbf{z_i'}$ as

$$\mathbf{L}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{z_i z_i'})\mathbf{L}' = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I_r} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\mathbf{L}$ is a $q \times q$ is a non-singular matrix. Partition $\mathbf{L}$ as $\mathbf{L}' = [\mathbf{L_1'} \;\; \mathbf{L_2'}]$, where $\mathbf{L_1}$ is of order $r \times q$. Define $r \times 1$ vector $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}$ by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{L_1 z_i}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq n$$

Note that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}' = \mathbf{L_1}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{z_i z_i'})\mathbf{L_1'} = \mathbf{I_r}$.
Suppose, $\mathbf{v_i} = (\mathbf{x_i'}\psi(\epsilon_\mathbf{1}), \mathbf{z_i'}\psi'(\epsilon_\mathbf{1}))'$. $\breve{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}' = (\mathbf{z_i'}, n^{-1})'$.

Let, $\mathbf{\Phi_V}$ denotes the normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and dispersion matrix $\mathbf{V}$ and $\phi_\mathbf{V}$ is the density of $\mathbf{\Phi_V}$. Write $\mathbf{\Phi_V} = \mathbf{\Phi}$ and $\phi_\mathbf{V} = \phi$ when $\mathbf{V}$ is the identity matrix. h', h'' denote respectively first and second derivatives of any real valued function h. Also $||.||$ denotes euclidean norm. Also assume that $(\mathbf{e_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e_p})'$ is the standard basis of $\mathscr{R}^p$. Let, $\mathbf{P}_*$ and $\mathbf{E}_*$ respectively denote conditional bootstrap probability and conditional expectation of G_1^* given data. Next we state the assumptions as follows:

(A.1) ψ is twice differentiable and ψ'' satisfies a Lipschitz condition of order α for some $0 < 2\alpha \leq 1$.

(A.2) (i) $\mathbf{A_n} \to \mathbf{A_1}$ as $n \to \infty$ for some positive definite matrix $\mathbf{A_1}$.

(ii) $\mathbf{E}(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{v_i v_i'}) \to \mathbf{A_2}$ as $n \to \infty$ for some non-singular matrix $\mathbf{A_2}$, where expectation is with respect to F.

(ii)′ $\mathbf{E}(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}') \to \mathbf{A_3}$ as $n \to \infty$ for some non-singular matrix $\mathbf{A_3}$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}$ is defined as same way as $\mathbf{v_i}$ with $\mathbf{z_i}$ being replaced by $\breve{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}$.

(iii) $n^{\alpha/2}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{d_i}||^{6+2\alpha})^{1/2} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}||^4 = O(n^{-1})$

(A.3) (i) $\mathbf{E}\psi(\epsilon_i) = 0$ and $\sigma^2 = \mathbf{E}\psi^2(\epsilon_1)/\mathbf{E}(\psi'(\epsilon_1)) \in (0, \infty)$.

(ii) $\mathbf{E}|\psi(\epsilon_i)|^4 + \mathbf{E}|\psi'(\epsilon_i)|^4 + \mathbf{E}|\psi''(\epsilon_i)|^2 < \infty$.

(A.4) G_i^* and ϵ_i are independent for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

(A.5) (i) $\mu_{G^*}^3 = \mathbf{E}G_1^{*3} < \infty$

(ii) $\mathbf{Var}(G_1^*) = \mu_{G^*}^2$, $\mathbf{E}(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*})^3 = \mu_{G^*}^3$.

(iii) $\big(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}\big)$ satisfies Cramer's condition:
$$\limsup_{|t|\to\infty} \big|\mathbf{E}\big(exp\big(it\big(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}\big)\big)\big)\big| < 1.$$

(iii)′ $\Big(\big(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}\big), \big(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}\big)^2\Big)$ satisfies Cramer's condition:
$$\limsup_{||(t_1,t_2)||\to\infty} \Big|\mathbf{E}\big(exp\big(it_1\big(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}\big) + it_2\big(G_1^* - \mu_{G^*}\big)^2\big)\big)\Big| < 1$$

(A.6) (i) $\big(\psi(\epsilon_1), \psi'(\epsilon_1)\big)$ satisfies Cramer's condition:
$$\limsup_{||(t_1,t_2)||\to\infty} \Big|\mathbf{E}\big(exp\big(it_1\psi(\epsilon_1) + it_2\psi'(\epsilon_1)\big)\big)\Big| < 1$$

(i)′ $\big(\psi(\epsilon_1), \psi'(\epsilon_1), \psi^2(\epsilon_1)\big)$ satisfies Cramer's condition:
$$\limsup_{||(t_1,t_2,t_3)||\to\infty} \Big|\mathbf{E}\big(exp\big(it_1\psi(\epsilon_1) + it_2\psi'(\epsilon_1) + it_3\psi^2(\epsilon_1)\big)\big)\Big| < 1$$

After observing data $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$, define $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i} = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i', \bar{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}')'$ where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{x_i}\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_i)$, $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{z_i}\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)$; $\{\bar{\epsilon}_1, \ldots, \bar{\epsilon}_n\}$ being the set of residuals. Also, define $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{2n} = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{x}}_\mathbf{i}\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\mathbf{i}'$ and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_\mathbf{1n} = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x_i}\mathbf{x_i}'\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)$. Note that $n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}'$ is an estimate of the matrix $\mathbf{E}(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v_i}\mathbf{v_i}')$ and due to assumption (A.2)(ii), $\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}'$ is non-singular for sufficiently large n. Hence, without loss of generality the canonical decomposition of $\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}'$ can be assumed as

$$\mathbf{B}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}'\Big)\mathbf{B}' = \mathbf{I_k}$$

where $k = p + q$ and $\mathbf{B}$ is a $k \times k$ is a non-singular matrix. Define $k \times 1$ vector $\check{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}$ by

$$\check{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{B}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}, \qquad 1 \le i \le n$$

To find valid EE, the following condition [cf. Navidi (1989)] is also required:

(A.7) There exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $-K_n(\delta)/log\gamma_n \to \infty$, where $\mathbf{B_n}(\delta) = \{1 \le i \le n : (\check{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}'\mathbf{t})^2 > \delta\gamma_n^2$ for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathscr{R}^k$ with $||\mathbf{t}||^2 = 1\}$, $K_n(\delta) = |\mathbf{B_n}(\delta)|$, the cardinality of the set $\mathbf{B_n}(\delta)$, and $\gamma_n = (\sum_{i=1}^n ||\check{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}||^4)^{1/2}$.

But note that the condition (A.7) is already been satisfied in our set up due to Lemma 5.2 and the proposition in Lahiri (1992).

Now we briefly explain the assumptions. Assumption (A.1) is smoothness condition on the score function $\psi(\cdot)$. This condition is essential in establishing EE of the perturbation bootstrapped M-estimator. Assumption (A.2) presents the regularity conditions on the design vectors necessary to find EE. For the validity of asymptotic normality of the regression M-estimator, only (A.1)(i) is enough [cf. Huber (1980)]; where as additional condition (A.2)(ii) is required for the validity of the EE. (A.2)(iii) states atmost how fast the L^2 norm of the design vectors can increase to get a valid EE. This condition is somewhat stronger than the condition assumed in Lahiri (1992); although this type of conditions are quite common in the literature of edgeworth expansions in regression setup; see Navidi (1989), Qumsiyeh (1990). Assumption (A.3) is the moment condition on the error variables through the score function $\psi(\cdot)$. (A.3)(i) is generally assumed to establish asymptotic normality. Assumption (A.4) is inherent in the present setup, since G_i^*'s are introduced by us to define the bootstrapped estimator whereas ϵ_i's are already present in the process of data generation. The conditions present in Assumption (A.5) are moment and smoothness conditions on the perturbing quantities G_i^*'s, required for the valid two term EE in bootstrap set-up. The Cramer's condition is very common in the literature of edgeworth expansions. Cramer's condition is satisfied when the distribution of G_1^* or $(G_1^*, (G_1^* - EG_1^{*2}))$ has a non-degenerate component which is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure [cf. Hall (1992)]. One immediate choice of the distribution of G_1^* is $Beta(\alpha, \beta)$ where $3\alpha = \beta = 3/2$. Also one can investigate *Generalized Beta* family of distributions for more choices of the distribution of G_1^*.

Assumption (A.6) is the Cramer's condition on the errors. Although this assumption is not needed for obtaining EE of the bootstrapped estimators, it is needed for obtaining EE for the original M-estimator.

We will denote the assumptions (A.1)-(A.5) by (A.1)′-(A.5)′ when (A.2) and (A.5) are respectively defined with (ii)′ and (iii)′ instead of (ii) and (iii).

4 Main Results

4.1 Rate of Perturbation Bootstrap Approximation

Here we will state the approximation results both in standardized and studentized setup. It is well known that $\sqrt{n}\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ has asymptotic variance $\sigma^2\mathbf{A_n^{-1}}$. So, the standardized version of the M-estimator $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is defined as $\mathbf{F_n} = \sqrt{n}\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{A_n^{1/2}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Now to define the standardized version of the corresponding bootstrapped statistic $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}}$, we need its conditional asymptotic variance, given the data. Using Taylor's expansion, it is quite easy to get the conditional asymptotic variance of $\sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ as $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}$. Note that inverse of the matrices $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}$ are well defined for sufficiently large sample size n due to the assumption (A.2)(i) and (A.3)(ii). Hence, the standardized bootstrapped M-estimator $\mathbf{F}^*_{\mathbf{n}}$ can be defined as

$$\mathbf{F}^*_{\mathbf{n}} = \sqrt{n}\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}})$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}} = \bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}^{\mathbf{1/2}}$ being defined in terms of the spectral decomposition of $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}$; although it can be defined in many different ways [cf. Lahiri (1994)]. Under some regularity conditions, both the distribution of $\mathbf{F_n}$ and the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{F}^*_{\mathbf{n}}$ can be shown to be -approximated asymptotically by a Normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and variance $\mathbf{I_p}$. Hence, it is straightforward that perturbation bootstrap approximation to the distribution of the M-estimator is first order correct. The second order result in standardized case is formally stated in Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose, the assumptions (A.1)-(A4), (A.5)(i) holds. Then there exist constant* $C_1 > 0$ *and a sequence of Borel sets* $\mathbf{A_{1n}} \subseteq \mathscr{R}^n$, *such that* $\mathbf{P}((\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{1n}}) \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$, *and given* $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{1n}}$, $n \geq C_1$ *such that there exists a sequence of statistics* $\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}_{n\geq 1}$ *depending on* $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{P}_*(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}} \text{ solves (2.1) and } ||\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}|| < C.n^{-1/2}.(logn)^{1/2}) \geq 1 - \delta_n n^{-1/2}$$

where $\delta_n \equiv \delta_n(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$ *tends to 0.*

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose,* $\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}_{n\geq 1}$ *be a sequence of statistics satisfying Proposition depending on* $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$. *Assume, the assumptions (A.1)-(A.5) hold.*

(a) *Then there exist constant* $C_2 > 0$ *and a sequence of Borel sets* $\mathbf{A_{2n}} \subseteq \mathscr{R}^n$ *and polynomials* $a_n^*(\cdot, \psi, G^*)$ *depending on distribution of* ϵ *and* G_1^* *and on* $\psi(\cdot)$ *through the finite moments of* G_1^* *and the derivatives of* $\psi(\cdot)$ *such that given* $(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{2n}}$, *with* $\mathbf{P}((\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{2n}}) \to 1$, *we have for* $n \geq C_2$,

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} |\mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{F_n^*} \in B) - \int_B \xi_n^*(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}| \leq \delta_n n^{-1/2}$$

where $\delta_n \equiv \delta_n(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$ *tends to 0 and* $\mathscr{B}$ *is a collection of borel subsets of* $\mathscr{R}^p$ *satisfying*

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} \mathbf{\Phi}((\delta B)^\epsilon) = O(\epsilon) \quad as\ \epsilon \downarrow 0 \tag{4.1}$$

and $\xi_n^*(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + n^{-1/2} a_n^*(\mathbf{x}, \psi, G^*))\phi(\mathbf{x})$.

(b) *Suppose in addition assumption (A.6)(i) holds. Then, for the collection of borel sets* $\mathscr{B}$ *satisfying (4.1),*

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} \left| \mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{F_n^*} \in B) - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{F_n} \in B) \right| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

Now, the quantity σ^2 is mostly unavailable in practical circumstances. Hence, the non-pivotal quantity like $\mathbf{F_n}$ is very rare in use in providing valid inferences. It is more reasonable to explore the asymptotic properties of a pivotal quantity, like the studentized version of the M-estimator $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$. Depending on the observed residuals $\bar{\epsilon}_i = y_i - \mathbf{x_i}'\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}},\ i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the natural way to define an estimator of σ^2 is $\hat{\sigma}_n^2$ where $\hat{\sigma}_n = s_n \tau_n^{-1}$, $\tau_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)$ and $s_n^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi^2(\bar{\epsilon}_i)$. Hence, the studentized M-estimator in regression setup may be defined as $\mathbf{H_n} = \sqrt{n}\hat{\sigma}_n^{-1} \mathbf{A_n^{1/2}} (\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Similarly, studentized version of the corresponding bootstrapped estimator can be construed as $\sqrt{n}\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{*\mathbf{-1/2}} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{n}}^* - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}})$ where $\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{*\mathbf{-1/2}}$ is defined in the same way as $\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{-1/2}}$ after replacing $\bar{\epsilon}_i$ by ϵ_i^*, $\epsilon_i^* = y_i - \mathbf{x_i'}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{n}}^*$, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. But this definition requires to obtain $\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{*\mathbf{-1/2}}$ at each bootstrap sample $(G_1^{*b}, \ldots, G_n^{*b})$, $b = 1, \ldots, B$. This is not computationally feasible since computation of $\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{*\mathbf{-1/2}}$ involves matrix inversion. So, let us define the studentized bootstrapped M-estimator in more computationally feasible way as

$$\mathbf{H_n^*} = \sqrt{n}\sigma_n^{*-1}\hat{\sigma}_n \bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{-1/2}} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{n}}^* - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}})$$

where $\sigma_n^* = s_n^* \tau_n^{*-1}$, $\tau_n^* = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi'(\epsilon_i^*)$, $s_n^{*2} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi^2(\epsilon_i^*)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_n^2$ and $\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{-1/2}}$ are as defined earlier.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose, the assumptions (A.1)-(A.5) hold.*

(a) *Then there exist constant* $C_3 > 0$ *and a sequence of Borel sets* $\mathbf{A_{3n}} \subseteq \mathscr{R}^n$ *and polynomials* $\tilde{a}_n^*(\cdot, \psi, G^*)$ *depending on distribution of* ϵ_1 *and* G_1^* *and on* $\psi(\cdot)$ *through the finite moments of* G_1^* *and the derivatives of* $\psi(\cdot)$, *with* $\mathbf{P}((\epsilon_1, \ldots\ldots, \epsilon_n) \in$

$\mathbf{A_{3n}}) \to 1$, *such that given* $(\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{3n}}$, *we have for* $n \geq C_3$ *and for the collection of borel sets defined by* (4.1),

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} |\mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{H}^*_{\mathbf{n}} \in B) - \int_B \tilde{\xi}^*_n(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}| \leq \delta_n n^{-1/2}$$

where $\tilde{\xi}^*_n(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + n^{-1/2}\tilde{a}^*_n(\mathbf{x}, \psi, G^*))\phi(\mathbf{x})$ *and* $\delta_n \equiv \delta_n(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$ *tends to 0.*

Suppose in addition assumption (A.6)(i)′ holds. Then

(b) *for the collection of borel sets* $\mathscr{B}$ *satisfying* (4.1),

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} \left|\mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{H}^*_{\mathbf{n}} \in B) - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{H_n} \in B)\right| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$$

(c) *if* $2E\psi^2(\epsilon_1)E\psi(\epsilon_1)\psi'(\epsilon_1) \neq E\psi'(\epsilon_1)E\psi^3(\epsilon_1)$, *then there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that,*

$$\mathbf{P}\Big(\liminf_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{n}\Big[\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} \left|\mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{H}^*_{\mathbf{n}} \in B) - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{H_n} \in B)\right|\Big] > \epsilon\Big) = 1$$

Remark 4.1. Proposition 4.1 states that outside a set of conditional probability $o(n^{-1/2})$, there exists a sequence of perturbation bootstrapped estimator $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ within a neighborhood of length $C.n^{-1/2}(logn)$ around the original M-estimator $\boldsymbol{\bar{\beta}_n}$. This existence result is essential in finding valid EEs. This can be compared with Theorem 2.3 (a) of Lahiri (1992) [hereafter, referred to as L(92)], where similar kind of result was shown in case of residual bootstrap.

Remark 4.2. Note that, where as the error term in approximating the distribution of M-estimator by perturbation bootstrap is of order $O_p(n^{-1/2})$ in the prevalent studentize setup, it reduces the order of the error of approximation to $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ in simple standardized setup. This means that the difference between coefficients corresponding to the term $n^{-1/2}$ in the EEs of original and bootstrapped estimator can be made arbitrarily small in standardized setup, but not in usual studentized setup.

Remark 4.3. To understand part (c) of Theorem 4.2, consider the usual least square estimator. In least square setup, the condition in the Theorem 4.2 (c) reduces to $E\epsilon^3 \neq 0$. This simply mean that if the studentization in perturbation bootstrapped version is performed analogously as in case of original least square estimator, then the bootstrap distribution could not correct the original distribution upto second order. If this is investigated more deeply, then it can be observed that the straightforward studentized perturbation bootstrap approximation can not correct for the skewness of the error distribution F.

4.1.1 Examples Theorem 4.2 concludes that the standard way of performing studentization of the bootstrapped estimator is first order correct. In order to show that the usual studentized setup is not second order correct, we consider following two important special cases with $\psi(x) = x$.

Example 4.1

Consider the observations $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ are coming from the distribution F with a location shift μ. This in terms of regression model becomes

$$y_i = \mu + \epsilon_i$$

Hence, in this setup $p = 1$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mu$ and $x_i = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

It can be shown that in this setup, $\tilde{\xi}_n(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{\xi}^*_n(\cdot)$, the EE of $\mathbf{H_n}$ and $\mathbf{H^*_n}$ respectively, turn out to be

$$\tilde{\xi}_n(x) = \Big[1 - n^{-1/2}\big\{\tilde{b}_{11}\frac{d}{dx} + 6^{-1}\tilde{b}_{31}\frac{d^3}{dx^3}\big\}\Big]\phi(x)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}^*_n(x) = \Big[1 - n^{-1/2}\big\{\tilde{b}^*_{11}\frac{d}{dx} + 6^{-1}\tilde{b}^*_{31}\frac{d^3}{dx^3}\big\}\Big]\phi(x)$$

where

$\tilde{b}_{11} = -2^{-1}\sigma^{-3}E\epsilon_1^3$, $\tilde{b}_{31} = -2\sigma^{-3}E\epsilon_1^3$
$\tilde{b}^*_{11} = -2\sigma_n^{-1}n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\epsilon}_i$, $\tilde{b}^*_{31} = \sigma_n^{-3} - 12\sigma_n^{-1}n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\epsilon}_i$

It is clear that $\tilde{b}^*_{11}$ as well as $\tilde{b}^*_{31}$ are not converging respectively to $\tilde{b}_{11}$ and $\tilde{b}_{31}$ in probability and hence the perturbation bootstrap method is not second order correct in the above setup when the bootstrapped estimator is studentized in the usual manner.

Example 4.2

Consider the simple linear regression model

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i + \epsilon_i$$

where β_0 and β_1 are parameters of interest and ϵ_i's are iid errors. This model, in terms of our multivariate linear regression structure, can be written as $y_i = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\mathbf{i}'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i$ where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1)'$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\mathbf{i} = (1, x_i)'$. Hence, the EEs of the original and bootstrapped estimators upto the order $o(n^{-1/2})$, after usual studentization, respectively becomes

$$\tilde{\xi}_n(y_1, y_2) = \left[1 - n^{-1/2}\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{2}\tilde{b}^{*(j)}_{11}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} + \sum_{j=0}^{3}\frac{\tilde{b}^{(j,3-j)}_{31}}{j!(3-j)!}D^{(j,3-j)}\Big\}\right]\phi(y_1, y_2)$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_n^*(y_1,y_2)=\left[1-n^{-1/2}\Big\{\sum_{j=1}^{2}\tilde{b}_{11}^{*(j)}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}+\sum_{j=0}^{3}\frac{\tilde{b}_{31}^{*(j,3-j)}}{j!(3-j)!}D^{(j,3-j)}\Big\}\right]\phi(y_1,y_2)$$

where

$\tilde{b}_{11}^{(j)}=-2^{-1}\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{e_j'A_n^{-1/2}\tilde{x}_i}\Big]\gamma_1$

$\tilde{b}_{11}^{*(j)}=o_p(1)$

$\tilde{b}_{31}^{(j_1,j_2)}=-2\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\mathbf{e_1'A_n^{-1/2}\tilde{x}_i})^{j_1}(\mathbf{e_2'A_n^{-1/2}\tilde{x}_i})^{j_2}\Big]\gamma_1$

$\tilde{b}_{31}^{*(j_1,j_2)}=\Big[n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\mathbf{e_1'\bar{A}_{2n}^{-1/2}\tilde{x}_i})^{j_1}(\mathbf{e_2'A_{2n}^{-1/2}\tilde{x}_i})^{j_2}\psi^3(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\Big]+o_p(1)$

where $j=1$ or 2, $j_1,j_2\in\{0,1,2,3\}$ such that $j_1+j_2=3$, γ_1 is the coefficient of skewness of ϵ_1, $\mathbf{\bar{A}_{2n}}$ is as defined in general setup and $\mathbf{A_n}=n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{\tilde{x}_i\tilde{x}_i'}=\begin{bmatrix}1 & \bar{x}\\ \bar{x} & \bar{x^2}\end{bmatrix}$ where $\bar{x}=n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i$ and $\bar{x^2}=n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_i^2$.

Note that, the coefficients $\tilde{b}_{11}^{(j)}$, $1\le j\le p$, all can not vanish together unless $\gamma_1=0$ and hence $\tilde{b}_{11}^{*(j)}$ can not converge to $\tilde{b}_{11}^{(j)}$ unless $\gamma_1=0$. Similarly, in case of the coefficients with index '31', the same condition is required to have the closeness. Hence, the two EEs can not get closer unless $\gamma_1=0$, similar to the Example 4.1. This is exactly what is stated in the part (c) of Theorem 4.2 in most general form.

4.2 Modification to the bootstrapped pivot

As it has been seen that $\mathbf{H_n^*}$, the usual studentized version of the perturbation bootstrapped estimator is not attending the desired optimal rate $o_p(n^{-1/2})$, so in the perspective of statistical inference, perturbation bootstrap is not advantageous over asymptotic normal approximation. For the sake of obtaining second order correctness, define the modified studentized $\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*}$ as

$$\mathbf{\tilde{H}_n^*}=\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\sigma}_n^*)^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_n\mathbf{\bar{\Sigma}_n^{-1/2}}(\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*}-\boldsymbol{\bar{\beta}_n}) \tag{4.2}$$

where

$\tilde{\sigma}_n^*=\tilde{s}_n^*\tilde{\tau}_n^{*-1}$, $\tilde{\tau}_n^*=n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\psi'(\epsilon_i^*)G_i^*$
$\tilde{s}_n^{*2}=n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\psi^2(\epsilon_i^*)(G_i^*-\mu_{G^*})^2$.

The bootstrapped statistic $\mathbf{\tilde{H}_n^*}$ can be seen to be achieving the optimal rate, namely $o_p(n^{-1/2})$, in approximating the original studentized M-estimator $\mathbf{H_n}$, which is formally stated in the following theorem:

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose, the assumptions* (A.1)′-(A.5)′ *hold. Also assume* $EG_1^{*4}<\infty$.

(a) *Then there exist constant* $C_4 > 0$ *and a sequence of Borel sets* $\mathbf{A_{4n}} \subseteq \mathscr{R}^n$ *and polynomials* $\bar{a}_n^*(\cdot, \psi, G^*)$ *depending on distribution of* ϵ_1 *and* G_1^* *and on* $\psi(\cdot)$ *through the finite moments of* G_1^* *and the derivatives of* $\psi(\cdot)$*, with* $\mathbf{P}((\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{4n}}) \to 1$*, such that given* $(\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{4n}}$*, we have for* $n \geq C_4$ *and for the collection of borel sets defined by* (4.1)*,*

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} |\mathbf{P}_*(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_\mathbf{n}^* \in B) - \int_B \bar{\xi}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}| \leq \delta_n n^{-1/2}$$

where $\bar{\xi}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + n^{-1/2}\bar{a}_n^*(\mathbf{x}, \psi, G^*))\phi(\mathbf{x})$ *and* $\delta_n \equiv \delta_n(\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n)$ *tends to 0.*

(b) *Suppose in addition assumption* (A.6)(i)$'$ *holds. Then for the collection of borel sets defined by* (4.1)*,*

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} \left|\mathbf{P}_*(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_\mathbf{n}^* \in B) - \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{H_n} \in B)\right| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

Remark 4.4. The modification that is needed to make the perturbation bootstrap method correct upto second order, suggests that besides incorporating the effect of bootstrap randomization through $\psi(\cdot)$ and $\psi'(\cdot)$ in the studentization factor of the bootstrap estimator, it is also essential to blend properly the effect of randomization that is coming directly from the perturbing quantities G_i^*s.

5 Proofs

First we define some notations. Throughout this section, $C, C_1, C_2, \ldots$ will denote generic constants that do not depend on the variables like n, x, and so on. For a non-negative integral vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_l)'$ and a function $f = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_l) : \mathscr{R}^l \to \mathscr{R}^l$, $l \geq 1$, write $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_l$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}! = \alpha_1! \ldots \alpha_l!$, $f^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = (f_1^{\alpha_1}) \ldots (f_l^{\alpha_l})$, $D^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} f_1 = D_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots D_l^{\alpha_l} f_1$, where $D_j f_1$ denotes the partial derivative of f_1 with respect to the jth component of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, $1 \leq j \leq l$. For $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots t_l)' \in \mathscr{R}^l$ and α as above, define $t^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = t_1^{\alpha_1} \ldots t_l^{\alpha_l}$. The collection $\mathscr{B}$ will always be used to denote the collection of Borel subsets of $\mathscr{R}^p$ which satisfy (4.1). μ_{G^*} and $\sigma_{G^*}^2$ will respectively denote mean and variance of G_1^*. All other notations that will be used, are somewhat same as in L(92). We want to mention here that only the important steps are presented in the proofs of the proposition and the theorems.
Before coming to the proofs we state some lemmas:

Lemma 5.1. *Let,* $\{\mathbf{Y_{in}} = (Y_{i1n}, Y_{i2n})', 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ *be a collection iid random vectors with* $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{Y_{1n}}) = \mathbf{0}$ *and there exists a constant* k *such that* $\mathbf{E}||\mathbf{Y_{1n}}||^3 < k$ *for all* $n \geq 1$*. Define, for some non random vectors* $\mathbf{l_{1i}}$ *and* $\mathbf{l_{2i}}$ *of dimensions* p_1 *and* p_2 *respectively*

for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ *with* $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{l_{ji}}\mathbf{l'_{ji}} = \mathbf{I_{p_j}}$ *and* $\tilde{\gamma}_n = (\sum_{j=1}^{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}||\mathbf{l_{ji}}||^4)^{1/2} = O(n^{-1/2})$,

$$\mathbf{U_{in}} = (\mathbf{l'_{1i}}Y_{i1n}, \mathbf{l'_{2i}}Y_{i2n})', \qquad \mathbf{V_n} = \mathbf{Disp}(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbf{U_{in}}), \qquad \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{in}} = \mathbf{V_n}^{-1/2}\mathbf{U_{in}}$$

for $1 \le i \le n$, *and* $\mathbf{S_n} = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{in}}$. *Let* $\tilde{\alpha}_{\mathbf{n}} = E||\mathbf{Y_{1n}}||^3 I(||\mathbf{Y_{1n}}||^2 > \lambda\tilde{\gamma}_n)$, *where* λ *satisfies* $0 < \lambda < \liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\lambda_n$, λ_n = *the smallest eigen value of* $\mathbf{\Sigma_n}$, $\mathbf{\Sigma_n} = \mathbf{Disp}(\mathbf{Y_{1n}})$. *Suppose that* $\tilde{\alpha}_n = o(1)$ *and* $\mathbf{Y_{1n}}$ *satisfies Cramer's condition. Suppose,* $\{\mathbf{M_{0n}}\}_{n\ge1}$, $\{\mathbf{M_{in}}\}_{n\ge1}, i = 1,\ldots,p$ *be* $(p+1)$ *sequence of matrices such that for each* $n \ge 1$, $\mathbf{M_{0n}}$ *is of order* $p\times(p+r)$. *and* $\mathbf{M_{in}}, 1 \le i \le p$, *are of order* $(p+r)\times(p+r)$, $p \ge 1$, $r \ge 1$. *Let,* $k = p + r$, $\bar{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{0n}} = [\mathbf{0} : I_r]_{r\times k}$ *and* $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{0n}} = [\mathbf{M_{0n}}' : \bar{\mathbf{M}}'_{\mathbf{0n}}]'$. *Define the functions* $g_n : \mathscr{R}^k \to \mathscr{R}^p$ *by* $g_n(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{M_{0n}x} + (\mathbf{x'M_{1n}x}, \ldots, \mathbf{x'M_{pn}x})'$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathscr{R}^k$, $n \ge 1$. *Assume that*

(a) $max\{||\mathbf{M_{in}}|| : 1 \le i \le p\} = O(\tilde{\gamma}_n)$.
(b) $||\mathbf{M_{0n}}|| = O(1)$, $\liminf_{n\uparrow\infty}\inf\{||\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{0n}}\mathbf{u}|| : ||\mathbf{u}|| = 1, \mathbf{u} \in \mathscr{R}^k\} \ge \delta$ *for some constant* $\delta > 0$.

Then any class $\mathscr{B}$ *of Borel sets in* $\mathscr{R}^p$ *satisfying (4.1),*

$$\sup_{B\in\mathscr{B}}|\mathbf{P}(g_n(\mathbf{S_n}) \in B) - \int_B \tilde{\xi}_n(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}| = o(\tilde{\gamma}_n) \quad as\ n \uparrow \infty$$

where $\tilde{\xi}_n(.) = (1 + n^{-1/2}\tilde{a}(F_0,.))\phi_{\mathbf{D_n}}(\cdot)$, $\mathbf{D_n} = \mathbf{M_{0n}M_{0n}}'$ *and* $\tilde{a}(F_0,.)$ *is a polynomial whose coefficients are continuous functions of* $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{Y_{1n}})^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, |\boldsymbol{\alpha}| \le 3$ *and* $||\tilde{a}(F_0,.))\phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_n}(\cdot)||$ $= O(\tilde{\gamma}_n)$. F_0 *is the distribution of* $\mathbf{Y_{1n}}$.

proof : The above Lemma follows from Lemma 3.1 and 3.2 of L(92).

Lemma 5.2. $(\sum_{i=1}^{n}||\breve{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}||^4)^{1/2} = O_P(n^{-1/2})$.

proof : Since, $\breve{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}} = \mathbf{B}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}$ for each $i \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, hence we have,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}||\breve{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}||^4 = \sum_{i=1}^{n}||\mathbf{B}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}||^4 \le ||\mathbf{B}||^4\sum_{i=1}^{n}||\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}||^4$$

Now if the canonical decomposition of $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}\bar{\mathbf{v}}'_{\mathbf{i}}$ is compared with the spectral decomposition of the same, then it is evident that $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{-1/2}$ where $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is the $k\times k$ diagonal matrix with eigenvalues of $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}\bar{\mathbf{v}}'_{\mathbf{i}}$ as the diagonal entries and $\mathbf{C}$ is the matrix of the orthonormal eigen-vectors of $n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}\bar{\mathbf{v}}'_{\mathbf{i}}$. Hence, due to assumption

(A.2)(ii), for sufficiently large n, $||\mathbf{B}||^2 = O_p(n^{-1})$.

Again, if $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ is the first r columns of $\mathbf{L}^{-1}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}||^4 \leq C.\Big[\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{x_i}||^4 \psi^4(\bar{\epsilon}_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{z_i}||^4 \psi'^4(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\Big]$$
$$= O_p(n) + C.||\tilde{\mathbf{L}}||^4 \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}||^4 \psi'^4(\bar{\epsilon}_i)$$

Now note that, $||\tilde{\mathbf{L}}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_\mathbf{i}')\tilde{\mathbf{L}}'|| = ||\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{z_i}\mathbf{z_i}'||$ and hence $||\tilde{\mathbf{L}}||^2 = O(\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{x_i}||^4) = O(n)$
So, by assumption (A.2)(iii), we have $\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\bar{\mathbf{v}}_\mathbf{i}||^4 = O_p(n)$.
Hence the lemma 5.2 follows.

Lemma 5.3. $(\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{d_i}||^6)^{1/4} + (\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{d_i}||^4)^{1/2} = O(n^{-1/2})$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{x_i}||^j = O(n)$, $j = 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 + 2\alpha$

proof : This lemma follows from assumption **A2** and by applying Hölders inequality.

5.1 Proof of Proposition 4.1

Suppose,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x_i}'\mathbf{t_n^*})G_i^* = \mathbf{0}$$

Then by Taylor's expansion we have,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_i)G_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\mathbf{x_i}'(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \mathbf{t_n^*})\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)G_i^* + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\frac{[\mathbf{x_i}'(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{t_n^*})]^2}{2}\psi''(u_i)G_i^* = 0 \quad (5.1)$$

where for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $|u_i - \bar{\epsilon}_i| \leq |\epsilon_i^* - \bar{\epsilon}_i|$.
Now (5.1) can be written as

$$L_n^*(\mathbf{t_n^*} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}) = \Delta_n^* + R_n^* \quad (5.2)$$

where
$\Delta_n^* = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_i\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_i)(G_i^* - \mu_{G^*})$
$L_n^* = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_i'\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)G_i^*$
$\mathbf{E}_* L_n^* = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_i'\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\mu_{G^*}$
$R_n^* = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_i\frac{[\mathbf{x}_i'(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \mathbf{t}_n^*)]^2}{2}\psi''(u_i)G_i^*$

By Fuk and Nagaev inequality (1971) [hereafter referred to as FN (71)], lemma 5.3, the Lipschitz property of $\psi''(\cdot)$ and the Taylor's expansion of $\psi(\cdot)$

and $\psi'(\cdot)$, it follows that there exist a constant $C > 0$ and a sequence of Borel sets $\mathbf{A}_n \subseteq \mathscr{R}^n$, such that given $(\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A}_n$ with $\mathbf{P}((\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A}_n) \to 1$, for $n \geq C$ and any $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$\mathbf{P}_*\Big(\big|\sum_{i=1}^{n} ||\mathbf{x_i}||^{3+\alpha}(G_i^* - EG_i^*)\big| > n\epsilon\Big) = o(n^{-1/2}) \tag{5.3}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_*\Big(\big|\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij}x_{ik}\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)(G_i^* - EG_i^*)\big| > n\epsilon\Big) = o(n^{-1/2}), \quad j,k \in \{1,\ldots,p\} \tag{5.4}$$

$$\mathbf{P}_*\Big(||\Delta_n^*|| > C.n^{-1/2}(logn)^{1/2}\Big) = o(n^{-1/2}) \tag{5.5}$$

Hence, from (5.3)-(5.5), on the set $\mathbf{A_n}$ and given $(\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_n}$ with $\mathbf{P}((\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_n}) \to 1$, for $n \geq C_1$, (5.2) can be rewritten as $(\mathbf{t_n^*} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n) = f_n(\mathbf{t}_n^* - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n)$, where f_n is a continuous function from $\mathscr{R}^p$ to $\mathscr{R}^p$ satisfying $\mathbf{P}_*(||f_n(\mathbf{t_n}^* - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n)|| \leq C_1.n^{-1/2}(logn)^{1/2}) = 1 - o(n^{-1/2})$ $\quad as\ n \to \infty$ whenever $||\mathbf{t_n^*} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}|| \leq C_1.n^{-1/2}(logn)^{1/2}$ for some constants $C_1 > 0$.

Hence, Proposition 4.1 follows by Browder's fixed point theorem.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Consider, the sequence of statistics $\{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{n}}^*\}_{n\geq 1}$ which satisfies the proposition. Then (5.2) can be written as

$$\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{n}}^* - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}) = L_n^{*-1}\sqrt{n}[\Delta_n^* + \tilde{\chi}_n^* + R_{1n}^*] \tag{5.6}$$

$$= L_n^{*-1}\sqrt{n}\Delta_n^* + R_{2n}^* \tag{5.7}$$

where $\quad \tilde{\chi}_n^* = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{x_i}\dfrac{[\mathbf{x_i}'(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{n}}^* - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}})]^2}{2}\psi''(\bar{\epsilon}_i)G_i^*$

Now, by FN(71), for some constant $C > 0$,

$$\mathbf{P}_*(||R_{1n}^*|| > C.n^{-(2+\alpha)/2}(logn)^{(2+\alpha)/2}) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}_*(||R_{2n}^*|| > C.n^{-1/2}(logn)) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$$

Again,

$$L_n^{*-1} = (\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1} + W_n^* + \tilde{Z}_n^* \tag{5.8}$$

where

$W_n^* = (\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1}(\mathbf{E}_*L_n^* - L_n^*)(\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1}$
$\tilde{Z}_n^* = (\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1}(\mathbf{E}_*L_n^* - L_n^*)(\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1}(\mathbf{E}_*L_n^* - L_n^*)L_n^{*-1}$

Now, it can be shown by FN(71) that for some constant $C_1 > 0$, as $n \geq C_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}_*(||\tilde{Z}_n^*|| > C_1.n^{-1/2}(logn)^{-1}) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}_*(||L_n^* - \mathbf{E}_* L_n^*|| > C_1.n^{-1/4}(logn)^{-1/2}) \\ &= o_p(n^{-1/2}) \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Therefore, it follows that there exists $C_2 > 0$ and a sequence of Borel sets $\mathbf{A_{2n}}$, such that $\mathbf{P}((\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{2n}}) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, and given $(\epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{2n}}$ and $n \geq C_2$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}) = (\mathbf{E}_* L_n^*)^{-1}\sqrt{n}\Delta_n^* + W_n^*\sqrt{n}\Delta_n^* + (\mathbf{E}_* L_n^*)^{-1}\sqrt{n}\chi_n^* + R_{3n}^* \tag{5.10}$$

where $\chi_n^* = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x_i}\dfrac{[\mathbf{x_i}'((\mathbf{E}_* L_n^*)^{-1}\Delta_n^*)]^2}{2}\psi''(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\mu_{G_*}$
and

$$\mathbf{P}_*(||R_{3n}^*|| = o(n^{-1/2})) = 1 - o(n^{-1/2})$$

Since $\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}} = O_p(1)$, so by the Corollary 2.6 of Bhattacharya and Rao (1986), we have

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} |\mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{F_n^*} \in B) - \mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{U_n^*} \in B)| = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \tag{5.11}$$

where $\mathbf{U_n^*} = \sqrt{n}\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}}\left[(\mathbf{E}_* L_n^*)^{-1}\Delta_n^* + W_n^*\Delta_n^* + (\mathbf{E}_* L_n^*)^{-1}\chi_n^*\right]$

Now, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, defining $Y_i^* = (G_i^* - \mu_{G^*})$, $\mathbf{X_i^*} = \check{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}} Y_i^*$, $\mathbf{V_n^*} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Disp}_*(\mathbf{X_i^*})$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathbf{i}}^* = \mathbf{V_n^{*-1/2}}\mathbf{X_i^*}$ and $\mathbf{S_n^*} = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{\mathbf{i}}^*$, it can be established that

$$\mathbf{U_n^*} = \mathbf{M_{0n}^*}\mathbf{S_n^*} + (\mathbf{S_n^{*\prime}}\mathbf{M_{1n}^*}\mathbf{S_n^*}, \ldots, \mathbf{S_n^{*\prime}}\mathbf{M_{pn}^*}\mathbf{S_n^*})' \tag{5.12}$$

where $\mathbf{M_{0n}^*} = O_p(1)$ and $\mathbf{M_{jn}^*} = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

Therefore, by Lemma 5.1 and 5.2,

$$\sup_{B \in \mathscr{B}} |\mathbf{P}_*(\mathbf{U_n^*} \in B) - \int_B \xi_n^*(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}| = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad as\ n \to \infty \tag{5.13}$$

where

$$\xi_n^*(\mathbf{x}) = \left[1 - n^{-1/2}\Big\{\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=1} b_{11}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})} D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=3} \frac{b_{31}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})}}{\boldsymbol{\nu}!} D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\Big\}\right]\phi(\mathbf{x}) \tag{5.14}$$

Now, the coefficients $b_{11}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})}$ and $b_{31}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})}$ can be computed using the transformation techniques of Bhattacharya and Ghosh (1978); although some modifications are needed to deal with the non-iid structure of our regression setup. If $\boldsymbol{\nu_1}$ is a $p \times 1$ vector with all the elements being 0, except the jth one and $\boldsymbol{\nu_2}$ is a $p \times 1$ vector with

all the elements being 0, except the j_1, j_2 and j_3 positions then after some algebraic calculations it can be shown that

$$b_{11}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu}_1)} = \sum_{k=1}^{p} h_{jkn}\Big(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\big[\mathbf{z_i'E_{kn}^*}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{x_i}\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\big]\Big) + (2n)^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{jin}^{*}\mathbf{x_i'}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{x_i}\psi''(\bar{\epsilon}_i) \tag{5.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_{31}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu}_2)} =& n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big[\Big(\prod_{m=1}^{3} a_{j_m in}^{*}\Big)\psi^3(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\Big] \\ &+ 2n^{-2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\Big[a_{j_1 in}^{*}a_{j_2 in}^{*}\big(\sum_{k=1}^{p} h_{j_3 kn}\mathbf{z_i'E_{kn}^*}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{x_j}\big)\psi^2(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_j)\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_j)\Big] \\ &+ 2n^{-2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\Big[a_{j_1 in}^{*}a_{j_3 in}^{*}\big(\sum_{k=1}^{p} h_{j_2 kn}\mathbf{z_i'E_{kn}^*}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{x_j}\big)\psi^2(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_j)\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_j)\Big] \\ &+ 2n^{-2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\Big[a_{j_2 in}^{*}a_{j_3 in}^{*}\big(\sum_{k=1}^{p} h_{j_1 kn}\mathbf{z_i'E_{kn}^*}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{x_j}\big)\psi^2(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_j)\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_j)\Big] \\ &+ 3n^{-3}\sum_{i,j,l=1}^{n} a_{j_1 in}^{*}a_{j_2 in}^{*}a_{j_3 in}^{*}\big(\mathbf{x_j'}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{x_l}\mathbf{x_l'}\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{x_i}\big)\psi''(\bar{\epsilon}_l)\psi^2(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\psi^2(\bar{\epsilon}_j) \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{1n}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}$ are as defined earlier and $\bar{\mathbf{A}}_{\mathbf{2n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}} = (\mathbf{h_{1n}}, \ldots, \mathbf{h_{pn}})$, $\mathbf{h_{jn}'x_i} = a_{jin}^{*}$, $\mathbf{h_{jn}} = (h_{1jn}, \ldots, h_{pjn})$, $j \in \{1, \cdots, p\}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\mathbf{E_{kn}^*}$ is a $q \times p$ matrix with $||\mathbf{E_{kn}^*}|| \leq q$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$

Now, one can find the two term EE of $\mathbf{F_n} = \sqrt{n}\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{A_n^{1/2}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$ as

$$\sup_{B\in\mathscr{B}} |\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{F_n} \in B) - \int_B \xi_n(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}| = o(n^{-1/2}) \quad as\ n \to \infty \tag{5.17}$$

where

$$\xi_n(\mathbf{x}) = \Big[1 - n^{-1/2}\Big\{\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=1} b_{11}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu})}D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=3}\frac{b_{31}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu})}}{\boldsymbol{\nu}!}D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\Big\}\Big]\phi(\mathbf{x}) \tag{5.18}$$

where the coefficients $b_{11}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu_1})}$ and $b_{31}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu_2})}$ are such that for all $j, j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $\big(b_{11}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu_1})} - b_{11}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu_1})}\big)$ and $\big(b_{31}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu_2})} - b_{31}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu_2})}\big)$ both can be shown to converge in probability to 0. Hence by (5.12)-(5.18), Theorem 4.1 follows.

5.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2

We have,

$$\mathbf{H_n^*} = \sqrt{n}\sigma_n^{*-1}\hat{\sigma}_n\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}}(\boldsymbol{\beta_n^*} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}) \tag{5.19}$$

where σ_n^* is as defined earlier. Now using Taylor's expansion and Lipschitz property of $\psi''(\cdot)$, it can be established that

$$\mathbf{H_n^*} = \mathbf{F_n^*} - \sqrt{n}\hat{\sigma}_n\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{n}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}}Z_n^*((\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1}\Delta_n^*) + R_{4n}^* \tag{5.20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_n^* =&(2s_n^3|\tau_n|)^{-1}\Big[2\tau_n s_n^2\Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\psi''(\bar{\epsilon}_i)[\mathbf{x_i}'((\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1}\Delta_n^*)]\Big) \\ &- \tau_n^2\Big(\frac{2}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\psi(\bar{\epsilon}_i)\psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)[\mathbf{x_i}'((\mathbf{E}_*L_n^*)^{-1}\Delta_n^*)]\Big)\Big] \end{aligned}$$

and there exist constants $C_3 > 0$ and a sequence of Borel sets $\mathbf{A_{3n}}$ such that $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A_{3n}}) \uparrow 1$ and given $(\epsilon_1, ...\epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{3n}}$ and $n \geq C_3$,

$$\mathbf{P}_*(||R_{4n}^*|| = o(n^{-1/2})) = 1 - o(n^{-1/2}) \tag{5.21}$$

Therefore, writing $\mathbf{H_n^*}$ as $\mathbf{H_n^*} = \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{n}}^* + R_{4n}^*$, we have

$$\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{n}}^* = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{0n}}^*\mathbf{S_n^*} + (\mathbf{S_n^{*\prime}}\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{1n}}^*\mathbf{S_n^*}, \ldots, \mathbf{S_n^{*\prime}}\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{pn}}^*\mathbf{S_n^*})' \tag{5.22}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{0n}}^* = O_p(1)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbf{jn}}^* = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

Hence, by Lemma 5.1,

$$\sup_{B\in\mathscr{B}}|\mathbf{P}_*(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{n}}^* \in B) - \int_B \tilde{\xi}_n^*(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}| = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad \text{as } n \to \infty \tag{5.23}$$

where

$$\tilde{\xi}_n^*(\mathbf{x}) = \left[1 - n^{-1/2}\Big\{\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=1}\tilde{b}_{11}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})}D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=3}\frac{\tilde{b}_{31}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})}}{\boldsymbol{\nu}!}D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\Big\}\right]\phi(\mathbf{x}) \tag{5.24}$$

Hence part (a) follows by Corollary 2.6 of Bhattacharya and Rao (1986).

Suppose the two term EE of the original studentized regression M-estimator $\mathbf{H_n} = \sqrt{n}\hat{\sigma}_n^{-1}\mathbf{A_n^{1/2}}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is

$$\tilde{\xi}_n(\mathbf{x}) = \left[1 - n^{-1/2}\Big\{\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=1}\tilde{b}_{11}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu})}D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\nu}|=3}\frac{\tilde{b}_{31}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu})}}{\nu!}D^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}\Big\}\right]\phi(\mathbf{x}) \tag{5.25}$$

Now part (b) of Theorem 4.2 follows directly by comparing (5.24) and (5.25). Again after some algebraic calculations, it can be shown that $\tilde{b}_{11}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu})}$ and $\tilde{b}_{31}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu})}$ both contain terms involving $\mu_3' = E\psi^3(\epsilon_1)$; whereas $\tilde{b}_{11}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})}$ contains no third order term (which converge in probability to μ_3') and $\tilde{b}_{31}^{*(\boldsymbol{\nu})}$ contains a third order term having coefficient different than that of $\tilde{b}_{31}^{(\boldsymbol{\nu})}$. Hence part (c) of Theorem 4.2 follows.

5.4 Proof of Theorem 4.3

We have the modified studentized bootstrapped M-estimator as,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} = \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\sigma}^*_n)^{-1}\hat{\sigma}_n\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}}_{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}) \tag{5.26}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}^*_n = \tilde{s}^*_n\tilde{\tau}^{*-1}_n$, $\tilde{\tau}^*_n = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi'(\epsilon^*_i)G^*_i$ and $\tilde{s}^{*2}_n = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi^2(\epsilon^*_i)(G^*_i - \mu_{G^*})^2$. Also suppose, $\bar{\tau}_n = \mu_{G^*}\tau_n$ and $\bar{s}^2_n = \sigma^2_{G^*}s^2_n$.

Now using the same line of arguments which is working behind (5.20) in the proof of Theorem 4.2, it can be shown that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} = \mathbf{F}^*_{\mathbf{n}} - \sqrt{n}\hat{\sigma}_n\bar{\mathbf{\Sigma}}^{-\mathbf{1/2}}_{\mathbf{n}}(Z^*_n - \bar{Z}^*_n)((\mathbf{E}_*L^*_n)^{-1}\Delta^*_n) + R^*_{5n} \tag{5.27}$$

where $\bar{Z}^*_n$ is as defined in the proof of Theorem 4.2 and $\tilde{Z}^*_n$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Z}^*_n =& 2^{-1}\big(\bar{\tau}_n\bar{s}_n\big)^{-2}\Bigg[2\bar{\tau}_n\bar{s}^2_n\Big(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi'(\bar{\epsilon}_i)(G^*_i - \mu_{G^*})\Big)\\ &- \bar{\tau}^2_n\Big(n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \psi^2(\bar{\epsilon}_i)[(G^*_i - \mu_{G^*})^2 - \sigma^2_{G^*}]\Big)\Bigg]\end{aligned}$$

and there exist constant $C_4 > 0$ and a sequence of Borel sets $\mathbf{A_{4n}}$ such that $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{A_{4n}}) \uparrow 1$ and given $(\epsilon_1, ...\epsilon_n) \in \mathbf{A_{4n}}$ and $n \geq C_4$,

$$\mathbf{P}_*(||R^*_{5n}|| = o(n^{-1/2})) = 1 - o(n^{-1/2}) \tag{5.28}$$

Therefore, defining $Y^*_{1i} = G^*_i - \mu_{G^*}$, $Y^*_{2i} = (G^*_i - \mu_{G^*})^2 - \sigma^2_{G^*}$
$\mathbf{X^*_i} = (\check{\mathbf{v}}'_{\mathbf{i}}Y^*_{1i}, n^{-1/2}Y^*_{2i})'$, $\mathbf{V^*_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Disp}_*(\mathbf{X^*_i})$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^*_{\mathbf{i}} = \mathbf{V}^{*-\mathbf{1/2}}_{\mathbf{n}}\mathbf{X^*_i}$
$\bar{\mathbf{S}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^*_{\mathbf{i}}$ with $\bar{\mathbf{v}}_{\mathbf{i}}$ defined with $\check{\mathbf{z}}_{\mathbf{i}}$ in place of $\mathbf{z_i}$.

Hence, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*_{\mathbf{n}}$ as $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} = \bar{\mathbf{U}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} + R^*_{5n}$, where

$$\bar{\mathbf{U}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} = \bar{\mathbf{M}}^*_{\mathbf{0n}}\bar{\mathbf{S}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} + (\bar{\mathbf{S}}^{*\prime}_{\mathbf{n}}\bar{\mathbf{M}}^*_{\mathbf{1n}}\bar{\mathbf{S}}^*_{\mathbf{n}}, \ldots, \bar{\mathbf{S}}^{*\prime}_{\mathbf{n}}\bar{\mathbf{M}}^*_{\mathbf{pn}}\bar{\mathbf{S}}^*_{\mathbf{n}})' \tag{5.29}$$

with $\bar{\mathbf{M}}^*_{\mathbf{0n}} = O_p(1)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{M}}^*_{\mathbf{jn}} = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

Hence, there exists a two term EE $\bar{\xi}^*(\cdot)$, as in Theorem 4.2, such that

$$\sup_{B\in\mathscr{B}} |\mathbf{P}_*(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*_{\mathbf{n}} \in B) - \int_B \bar{\xi}^*_n(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}| = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad as\ n \to \infty \tag{5.30}$$

Now, $\bar{\xi}^*_n(\cdot)$ can be found explicitly as in standardized case. Again if $\bar{\xi}^*_n(\cdot)$ is compared with $\tilde{\xi}_n(\cdot)$, given by (5.25), then it can be established that all the coefficients in $\bar{\xi}^*_n(\cdot)$ are close in probability to that of $\tilde{\xi}_n(\cdot)$, unlike the case of naive studentized bootstrapped estimator. One point we want to make here that the term $\bar{Z}^*_n$ which is present in the expression of $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}^*_{\mathbf{n}}$, unlike the expression of $\mathbf{H}^*_{\mathbf{n}}$, introduces important third order terms which are crucial in getting second order correctness. Therefore, Theorem 4.3 follows.

6 Conclusion

Second order results of Perturbation Bootstrap method in regression M-estimation are established. It is shown that the classical way of studentization in bootstrap setup is not sufficient for correcting the distribution of the regression M-estimator upto second order. This is a general statement corresponding to the fact that the usual studentized bootstrapped estimator is not capable of correcting the effect of skewness of the error distribution in least square regression. A novel modification is proposed in general set-up by properly incorporating the effect of the randomization of the random perturbing quantities in the prevalent studentization factor and is shown as second order correct. Thus, in a way the results in this paper establish perturbation bootstrap method as a refinement of the approximation of the exact distribution of the M-estimator over asymptotic normality. This is an important finding from the perspective of valid inferences regarding the regression parameters.

References

ALLEN, M. and DATTA, S. (1999). A Note on Bootstrapping M-Estimators in ARMA Models. *J. Time Series Analysis* **20** 365–379.

BHATTACHARYA, R. N. and GHOSH, J. K. (1978). On the validity of the formal Edgeworth expansion. *Ann. Statist.* **6** 434-451.

BHATTACHARYA, R. N. and RANGA RAO, R. (1986). *Normal approximation and asymptotic expansions*. John Wiley & Sons.

BICKEL, PETER J. and FREEDMAN, D. A.. (1981). Some Asymptotic Theory for the Bootstrap. *Ann. Statist.* **9.6** 1196–1217.

CHATTERJEE, S. and BOSE, A. (2005). Generalized bootstrap for estimating equations. *Ann. Statist.* **33** 414-436.

CHATTERJEE, A. and LAHIRI, S. N.. (2013). Rates of convergence of the adaptive LASSO estimators to the oracle distribution and higher order refinements by the bootstrap. *Ann. Statist.* **41** 1232–1259.

CHENG, G. and HUANG, J. Z.. (2010). Bootstrap consistency for general semiparametric M -estimation. *Ann. Statist.* **38** 2884–2915.

CHENG, G. (2015). Moment Consistency of the Exchangeably Weighted Bootstrap for Semiparametric M-estimation. *Scand J Statist.* **42** 665–684.

DAS, D. and Lahiri S. N. (2015). Supplement to "Second Order Correctness of Perturbation Bootstrap M-Estimator of Multiple Linear Regression Parameter".

EL BANTLI, F. (2004). M-estimation in linear models under nonstandard conditions. *J. Multivariate Analysis* **121** 231-248.

FREEDMAN, D. A.. (1981). Bootstrapping Regression Models. *Ann. Statist.* **9.6** 1218–1228.

FUK, D. H. and NAGAEV, S. V. (1971). Probabilistic inequalities for sums of independent random variables. *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.* **16** 660-675.

HALL, P. (1992). *The bootstrap and Edgeworth expansion*. Springer Series in Statistics.

HLAVKA, Z. (2003). Asymptotic properties of robust three-stage procedure based on bootstrap for M-estimator. *J. Statistical Planning and Inference* **115** 637-656.

HU, F. (1996). Efficiency and Robustness of a Resampling M-Estimator in the Linear Model. *J. Multivariate Analysis* **78** 252-271.

HUBER, P. (1981). *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, New York.

JIN, Z. , YING, Z. and WEI, L. J. (2001). A simple resampling method by perturbing the minimand. *Biometrika*. **88** 381-390 .

LAHIRI, S. N. (1992). Bootstrapping M-estimators of a multiple linear regression parameter. *Ann. Statist.* **20** 1548-1570.

LAHIRI, S. N. (1994). On two-term Edgeworth expansions and bootstrap approximations for Studentized multivariate M-estimators. *Sankhya A*. **56** 201-226.

LAHIRI, S. N. (1996). On Edgeworth Expansion and Moving Block Bootstrap for Studentized M-Estimators in Multiple Linear Regression Models. *J. Multivariate Analysis* **56** 42-59.

LAHIRI, S. N., and ZHU, J.. (2006). Resampling methods for spatial regression models under a class of stochastic designs. *Ann. Statist.* **34** 1774-1813.

LEE, STEPHEN M.S. (2012). General M-estimation and its bootstrap. *J. Korean Statistical Society* **41** 471-490.

MA, S. and KOSOROK, M. R. (2004). Robust semiparametric M-estimation and the weighted bootstrap. *J. Multivariate Analysis* **96** 190-217.

MINNIER, J., TIAN, L. and CAI, T. (2011). A perturbation method for inference on regularized regression estimates. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **106** 1371-1382.

NAVIDI, W.. (1992). Edgeworth Expansions for Bootstrapping Regression Models. *Ann. Statist.* **17** 1472–1478.

QUMSIYEH, M. B. (1990). Edgeworth expansion in regression models. *J. Multivariate Analysis* **35** 86-101.

QUMSIYEH, M. B. (1994). Bootstrapping and empirical edgeworth expansions in multiple linear regression models. *J. Multivariate Analysis* **35** 86-101.. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods* **23** 3227–3239.